

Walter Mertens

Evaluation Report:
Francophone Regional Advisory Committee (FRAC)

Family Planning Management Development (FPMD)

Project Number: 936-3055

Agreement Number: CCP-A-00-95-00000-02

Office of Population, USAID

Management Sciences for Health

165 Allandale Road

Boston, MA 02130

April 1995

EVALUATION REPORT:
FRANCOPHONE REGIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE (FRAC)

APRIL 1995

Walter Mertens

FAMILY PLANNING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Project No.: 936-3055
Contract No.: DPE-3055-C-00-0051-00
Task Order No.: A1700 EVPRG

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank all of the FRAC members who gave their time to assist him in this evaluation. Their comments during interviews provided invaluable information, not only for FPMD's evaluation purposes, but also for application to the future of FRAC. Also Sylvia Vriesendorp, whose hard work in developing and maintaining the FRAC has produced a remarkable success story. Corinne Nagy, Senior Program Assistant in FPMD's Africa Unit, and Denise Daly, Assistant Project Accountant, provided indispensable assistance with logistics. Donna Monahan, Senior Program Assistant in FPMD's Evaluation Unit, provided research and editorial assistance.

ACRONYMS

CA	Cooperating Agency
CAFS	Centre for African Family Studies
CBD	Community Based Distribution
CEDPA	Centre for Development and Population Activities
CERPOD	Centre for Applied Research on Population and Development
FPMD	Family Planning Management Development
FRAC	Francophone Regional Advisory Committee
MIS	Management Information Systems
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. THREE GREAT OUTCOMES OF FRAC	2
A. FRAC has brought into existence a sense of a family planning community where before there was only fragmentation of interests in a very difficult environment.	
B. FRAC is a forum of exchange among persons with the same interests.	
C. FRAC is an important mechanism for knowledge transfer in the management of family planning programs and related health services.	
III. DID FRAC HAVE AN IMPORTANT IMPACT ON THE CONDUCT OF FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN MANAGEMENT?	8
A. Examples: Acceptance of population and family planning policies	
B. Examples: Integration of family planning services	
C. Examples: Supervision	
D. Examples: Quality of services	
E. Examples: Decentralization	
F. Examples: Support from the private sector and other segments of society	
G. Examples: Relations with donors	
IV. FORMAT OF FRAC	12
A. The annual meeting	
B. Field visits	
C. Communication during the inter-meeting periods	
V. THE FUTURE OF FRAC	24
A. Institutionalization of FRAC	
B. Functions of FRAC	
C. Membership in FRAC	
D. Role and nature of the annual meeting	
E. Preparation of FRAC annual meetings	
F. Follow-up and communication	
G. FRAC and similar efforts of other agencies in Francophone Africa	
H. FRAC and the donor community	
VI. CONCLUSIONS	30
Annex 1 Methodology	
Annex 2 List of Documents	
Annex 3 List of Persons Interviewed	
Annex 4 Country Representation at FRAC	
Annex 5 Map	
Annex 6 Statistical Tables	

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Francophone Regional Advisory Committee (FRAC) is a program of the Family Planning Management Development (FPMD) project of Management Sciences for Health (MSH), in collaboration with the Center for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA). It has been selected for an in-depth evaluation as part of an effort to determine the impact of FPMD's assistance. Unlike the five countries selected for in-depth evaluation, FPMD assistance to the FRAC does not consist of technical assistance to organizations which can be called "clients." FRAC is, rather, a loose network of senior family planning managers and policy-makers from Francophone Africa and Haiti. FPMD's assistance to the FRAC involves organizing and facilitating annual meetings where specific family planning program management issues are discussed. Based on semi-structured interviews with FRAC participants, this evaluation report examines FPMD's assistance within the context of the role and impact of the FRAC and offers recommendations for the future.

The FRAC is seen to have developed three key roles, discussed in detail in Section II:

- *As a central player in the formation of a family planning community* where there had been fragmentary interest in a difficult environment. FRAC participants frequently mentioned support received within the FRAC network as being crucial to their work in family planning in their countries.
- *As a forum of exchange* among persons with the same interests. The annual meetings provide an excellent framework for participants to talk about their experiences and learn lessons from the experiences of others.
- *As a mechanism for knowledge transfer* in the management of family planning programs and related health services. Participants, some of whom had not had exposure to modern management thinking as applied to family planning programs, continually stressed the value of the large amounts of information provided about management issues.

Impact of the FRAC is discussed in Section III. Participants cited impact in several areas: country acceptance of population and family planning activities, integration of family planning services, supervision, quality of services, decentralization, private sector support, and relations with the donor community. Section IV presents findings regarding the format of the FRAC.

All of the participants interviewed stressed that the FRAC should continue, but the majority wanted some changes. Their suggestions have been classified into eight areas which are discussed in Section V: the institutionalization, functions, and membership of the FRAC; the role and nature of the annual meetings; follow-up and communication between meetings; relationships with other agencies with similar interests; and relations with the donor community.

The report outlines three conclusions from the evaluation:

- *FRAC is a very successful program*, as evidenced in the development of its roles in Francophone Africa and Haiti and its impact on the conduct of family planning programs through improvements in management.

- *It is possible to establish an informal but important family planning network where the subject remains controversial.* It appears that the combination of a crisis situation with the work of highly motivated people has created environmental conditions in which such an informal network can flourish.
- *FRAC is at a very important stage in its development.* At this stage many decisions must be made about: the need for support during the likely shift from FPMD sponsorship; the need to search for alternative funding sources; the need for rethinking the format of the annual meetings and other aspects of the FRAC; the need for more attention to interaction during the periods between meetings; and the need for measures that will allow the program to quickly and easily to incorporate ideas developed within the context of the FRAC, both during and between meetings.

II. THREE GREAT OUTCOMES OF FRAC

FRAC is both a remarkable institution and a continuous process (see Box 1 for a short description of FRAC). While it does not have the characteristics of a stable permanent organization, it is perceived by many in Francophone Africa and Haiti as an important feature of the family planning scene in these countries. It is also a continuous process of intercommunication with a steady annual rhythm, as evidenced by the annual meeting¹ of the FRAC network. FRAC can be credited with three important outcomes. First, FRAC has brought into existence a sense of family planning community among family planning managers where before there was only fragmentation of interests in a very difficult environment. Second, FRAC is a forum of exchange among persons with the same interest in appropriate population policies and improved family planning programs. Third, FRAC is an important mechanism for knowledge transfer in the management of family planning programs and related health services.

A. FRAC has brought into existence a sense of a family planning community where before there was only fragmentation of interests in a very difficult environment.

Many who had participated in several FRAC meetings favorably compare the current situation for population policies and family planning activities in their countries with that of ten to fifteen years ago, while still recognizing that they continue to work in a difficult environment where in many quarters the issue of family planning remains very delicate. As one participant puts it: "FRAC makes us feel as a big extended family where before we were just wrestling as

¹We use the term "meeting", as in English-language documents dealing with FRAC, to translate the French term "rencontre" used for the annual FRAC encounter. "Rencontre" is a term with more content and has a connotation with terms such as interaction, communication, interchange in a congenial atmosphere. Participants in the interviews use an assortment of terms besides "rencontre": meeting (réunion), seminar (séminaire), workshop (atelier), carrefour (crossroad meeting). We have retained these terms as used by the interviewees in the citations from the interviews.

individuals to transform a taboo issue into a matter of public and private concern. FRAC really deals with problems of interest to the whole family planning community of Francophone Africa."

FRAC, according to many interviewees has "broken the isolation in which we used to work. When I have to defend my program in my country I feel I am not alone any more. In addition FRAC has given me more arguments to defend the program and my involvement in it." FRAC, as another veteran participant put it, "is a network of solidarity and a reference point for concerted action in family planning for Francophone Africa. Through FRAC we have become aware of the communality of our problems. FRAC has transformed us into a community of problem-solvers. FRAC is a sect but with wide open doors."

Box 1 What is FRAC?

FRAC was established in 1987 and is a network of senior family planning managers and policy makers from Francophone Africa and Haiti. They meet annually to discuss a specific family planning program management issue, selected by the members of the network themselves. It is a program of the FPMD project of Management Sciences for Health in collaboration with the Centre for Development and Population Activities. FRAC members have met each year since 1987 (except for 1990, when the Gulf War imposed travel restrictions) as the following table shows (see Annex 4 for country representation at FRAC meetings):

Meeting Number/Date	Theme	Place	Participants	Observers/ Facilitators/ Administrators
I. 1987	FRAC start-up meeting	Massachusetts, USA	8	12
II. 1988	Integration	Marrakech, Morocco	15	6
III. 1989	Community participation	Dakar, Senegal	21	6
IV. 1991	Quality of services	Boston, MA, USA	27	17
V. 1992	Decentralization	Kigali, Rwanda	28	8
VI. 1993	Supervision	Tunis, Tunisia	26	12
VII. 1994	Sustainability	Conakry, Guinea	29	26

FRAC participants repeatedly brought up the issue of political commitment and how useful FRAC had been in helping them understand the importance of such commitment, of changes in negative public attitudes, and of the promotion of positive commitment. In the past, positive reception of family planning in government circles was not only completely absent, the atmosphere was definitely negative (see Box 2 for a short reminder of the family planning situation in Francophone Africa).

A common problem in Francophone Africa is the occasional opposition from established religion (Catholicism and Islam). The spirit of community created by FRAC makes it easier to deal with this obstacle. "Meeting with persons from other Moslem countries," as one participant said, "enabled me to discuss common problems brought up by persons who gave wrong interpretations of the Koran in regard to family planning." Few things during the Conakry meeting were as moving as a reception of a group of FRAC participants by the most important imams of the Kankan region, one of the regions in Guinea selected for a field trip. FRAC participants were all seated on carpets in the modest house of the most senior imam of the region. The meeting started with a long recitation of verses from the Koran in favor of family planning. This was followed by an informal dialogue during which the imams lauded the local family planning organization and its activities.

Although enormous progress has been made in the understanding of population and reproductive problems in Francophone Africa, not all hostility towards family planning has disappeared. One participant mentioned how, on world population day in her country, a newspaper printed an editorial stating that there was no population problem in the country because of low population density and thus no need for family planning. "This shows," she concluded, "that we still need more awareness creation. Fortunately FRAC, even invisibly, supports me in such adverse circumstances because I feel the strength of my colleagues behind me."

The feeling of community is perceived not only on the abstract level of ideas and strategies. It is also very much felt on the personal level as the following statement shows: "To see the commitment of my peers in the other countries reinforced my own motivation." Another member asserted that the FRAC meetings present a great opportunity to see colleagues in an extremely favorable environment and that, in fact, these meetings had improved her relations with them. "It is easier to deal with them when they are outside their structure and to discuss program problems with them when they are in the womb of the annual FRAC meetings," she concluded.

B. FRAC is a forum of exchange among persons with the same interests.

Another major theme stressed, closely linked to the previous one, is the opportunity FRAC creates for learning about the family planning experiences of other countries and the lessons that can be learned from these experiences. "FRAC has impressed me very much as an effort to provide exchange on program experience," emphasized one participant. Being in another country and making field visits and learning about other countries really enriches one's insights." One interviewee puts it more vividly: "In Francophone Africa family planning is like a spider web with many holes. We have to put stitches in the holes so that the web really becomes strong and functional. FRAC knows how to glean useful elements from several programs and then succeeds in integrating them into a tight spider web. In addition, the many personal contacts at the FRAC encounter are a rich source of informal exchange." As another interviewee puts it, "one learns many things beyond the formal hours of the program." Another FRAC member compares his involvement in FRAC as an odyssey which makes one go to different parts of the world, always

encountering new adventures, meeting new people, and acquiring novel experiences in the family planning sphere.

Many participants strongly credit FRAC for promoting this exchange. In the words of many participants the annual meeting provides an excellent framework for the participants to talk about their experiences. As one participant describes graphically: "We impregnate each other mutually. We get information and new ideas from other countries. Communication is easy because we are using the same language." Furthermore, the whole environment at the annual meetings, as many stress, makes interchange easy. "One of its chief attractions can be said to be that we lose our timidity, we can analyze ourselves, its fertility decline. It is just folded in like a thread in a shell" are all samples of these impressions of relaxation.

Some persons were very concrete in what the exchange consisted of: "I brought documents on our family planning experience from my country and others profited from them. I also profited from other countries. We still do not have regional units as in this country [Guinea] but I am going to introduce them in my return. Differences between Anglophone and Francophone countries rooted in the precolonial past—such as religious composition, social customs and political structure—differences in colonial history, not differences in social and economic factors, seem to be primarily responsible for the differences in the timing and spread of family planning activities between Anglophone and Francophone Africa. It is true that several Francophone countries—probably as a consequence of cultural differences—have lower literacy rates and school enrollment rates (see Table 2 of *Anglophone and Francophone Africa*). The developed in a way that transformed all FRAC members from outside the country into group of external expert advisers, as one participant aptly describes: "We became kind of expert diagnosticians for our Guinea colleagues. We were able to make a diagnosis of the situation. Our report was radioscopic, and will have done good work for Guinea. The external eye is very useful." The following quote is excerpted from a letter from one of the hosts for the field visits: "After the field visit we established a consultative committee for the NGOs. . . . We also noted a clear improvement in the positive interventions of the religious authorities in the rural radio programs. Family planning messages in religious ceremonies become more and more favorable in the region. All those important changes are the fruit of FRAC VII."

C. FRAC is an important mechanism for knowledge transfer in the management of family planning programs and related health services.

Most participants would agree with one among them who described his participation in the FRAC seminars as "an immersion in a luxurious bath of information." Other terms used are: a wealth of information, a cornucopia of information, extremely enriching experience, an extremely well-selected flood of documents to take home, and extremely well-chosen reference documents. One participant concludes his assessment of FRAC by declaring that "it is an instrument through which a professional corps helps professionals to acquire a host of useful information. It is a first rate formula for Francophone Africa!" FRAC members choose the theme of the workshops themselves and therefore feel that the seminars correspond to their needs.

The value of the FRAC meetings and network as a source of new awareness and knowledge about management issues for family planning is constantly emphasized. For many participants, it was their first contact with modern management thinking as applied to family planning programs. "We discovered that management is something which can be organized and planned" is a statement which reflects the feeling of many participants. As another participant says: "FRAC really brings us into contact with themes which correspond to management problems. It deals with themes which are really our concern. The topics of the meetings are very close to the concerns of my program such as decentralization of management. Through FRAC we were able to grasp and to define the concept of decentralization. Before we were talking about it but now we came back with firm ideas about the contents of a decentralization process for our program." Participants also stress that knowledge is transferred through a process actively involving all participants in the knowledge-creation process: "For me the FRAC meetings are a choice battlefield. Everyone makes contributions. One goes there to get new weapons and one returns in new battle dress (avec des armes bien filées)."

Similar statements were expressed in connection with the Conakry meeting. The vast majority thought that the theme was very relevant and well-chosen. As one participant states: "Now that we are going through a crucial transition of FRAC, one could not find a better suited theme for the seventh FRAC meeting." Participants realize that it is impossible to continue current family planning and health programs with such a large proportion of the resources derived from foreign aid: "It is really a theme of current interest in view of the fact that most health programs in Africa are assisted from outside sources." Many participants referred to personal experiences in funding delays and other problems with donor agencies as a reason for their strong interest in the theme of viability.² The very few (less than one percent) who thought that the theme was not relevant based their opinion on the observation that "the elements of viability have not yet been fulfilled in Francophone Africa." This rather desolate argument, although rooted in fact, can be interpreted as just another argument for the necessity of a meeting on viability. The seventh FRAC meeting also made it clear that sustainability is more comprehensive than just surviving financially: "Many people talk about viability in exclusively financial terms. This encounter is making us much more aware that it is not just a question of money and that in fact to increase your financial resources and financial independence the program needs to possess a series of key characteristics which often are not subsumed under viability. It was a new vision to see that sustainability has many more dimensions than just the financial one." Discovery, revelation, and new vision are terms which indeed are frequently used by the FRAC participants in describing their impressions. To quote "to me the Boston seminar on the quality of services was a revelation."

Many participants stress that not only is theoretical knowledge acquired, but also practical knowledge for what should be done in the field. As one participant puts it: "It is not just

² The French translation used for sustainability is 'viabilité' and we have kept the English equivalent "viability" in the cited answers because it better reflects the French meaning.

theoretical notions we learn, but we learn what really should be decentralized in the field. FRAC really touches on concrete topics. I have a better understanding that decentralization means decentralization not only of resources, but also of management. We are exposed to practical experience which has real theoretical implications." The fact that the workshop every year is organized in a different country is often given credit for the close proximity to field experience which permeates the workshops, as reflected in the following statement: "I have been able to observe during the Tunis workshop how things were more advanced there than in our program. Responsibility of every person in our program is now well-defined and because of that, supervision occurs more smoothly." Similar feelings are expressed by another FRAC member: "FRAC has provided us with tools and instruments which are useful to our work such as supervision, especially adaptable to the context and problems of our country. One becomes more insightful in grasping the problem in our national context. It also stimulates us towards more action. We always return with the intention and the motivation to change something in our programs such as improvement of the quality of our programs. We now have introduced indicators to measure it."

III. DID FRAC HAVE AN IMPORTANT IMPACT ON THE CONDUCT OF FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN MANAGEMENT?

Although some participants were not able to come up with concrete things that had changed under the impact of FRAC, many others provided us with an anthology of changes introduced after participation in FRAC workshops. Some described these changes as radical. The majority feels that while no radical innovations had been introduced, crucial attitudes and methods had changed. The subsequent paragraphs give concrete examples of the impact of FRAC in the words of the participants. They have been grouped by theme, but they often partially overlap.

A. Examples: Acceptance of population and family planning policies

- FRAC has helped us in our country to accelerate the adoption of the government document on population policies. We participated in its elaboration and in the facilitation of it through national and regional workshops. The invisible support³ of FRAC helped us to organize seminars for health agents and opinion leaders. We also helped in the elaboration of a new Family Code which now has been submitted to the government. We also put together training curricula on management and contraceptive technologies.
- I have attended several FRAC meetings. They both provided ideas and psychological support in meetings with several ministers whom I tried to convince of the importance of family planning in the health services of the our country. Once the idea of family planning became politically acceptable I continued my meetings with them to show how family planning programs can be improved.

³ 'Invisible support' is an expression used by many FRAC members to describe the support given by FRAC.

- In view of the fact that I occupy a relatively high level post in my country I can say that FRAC played an important role in the process of the legitimization of family planning in my country.

B. Examples: Integration of family planning services

- The Tunis seminar was very relevant to our work and we drew many lessons from it in regard to the integration of family planning and other services. We inserted family planning in services where before there was no family planning. Now 70 percent of the health centers in the rural areas and 100 percent in the urban areas provide family planning in integrated fashion. The health agents had a tendency to compartmentalize the services. In the morning, health and in the afternoon, family planning! With the emphasis on the quality of service, we made sure that family planning gets integrated in a flexible manner and in a way that our clients can take care of their health and family planning needs in a non fragmented approach. As a result we have much happier clients.
- We realized that personnel training for our health agents did not include family planning. Family planning is now an integral part of their training. Furthermore, we decentralized their training. Initially all training was done from the capital out. Now each region has its own team of trainers.
- We put together a strategic document on the integration of family planning service into health services. It contains sections on the norms and standards for good service delivery.

C. Examples: Supervision

- After we returned from the FRAC meeting we organized two workshops on supervision. One was a national workshop of reflection (atelier de reflection) to see what could be done in the matter of supervision. We reflected on the failure of the current system and compared it with an ideal model of supervision which simultaneously was integral, polyvalent and formative (formatrice). We reviewed the whole hierarchy of supervision from the national level through region and district level down to the health agents. The other workshop dealt with training in supervision. To organize the workshop we had to reflect on what the workshop should include to give good training in supervision. We produced training modules and invited the trainers of the trainers to review them.
- As a consequence of the Tunis seminar we improved our system supervision. We have produced several brochures. After Kigali we introduced a Manual of Norms and Procedures. It enabled us to discover many weak points in our supervision but it also showed opportunities for more efficient supervision.

D. Examples: Quality of services

- We tried to provide good services but we were unaware of the concept of the quality of services and its application to health and family planning services. We now (that's after the FRAC seminar) understand the importance of it and we have organized sessions with physicians and other health workers to discuss the issue in depth and to take measures to improve the quality of our programs. We became convinced that for a high quality family planning program a mix of good contraceptives needs to be available. The use of NORPLANT in our program is a direct consequence of the emphasis on a wide selection of contraceptives options. We started with a pilot project to plan its introduction later on a larger scale.
- The Morocco FRAC II seminar and its report have served as an inspiration to clarify our approaches, to analyze results from our research office within new perspectives acquired at the seminar and to draw the attention of our cadres at the Health Ministry. We elaborated a better adjusted information strategy and special plans for the insertion of family planning in informal education, mass communications for TV, radio and press. We also compiled a manual on contraceptive methods which is used as a reference document for the training of personnel and a training guide for interpersonal communication and counseling on family planning.
- Once back from the FRAC meeting we organized one national workshop on quality of services and four regional ones.
- Once back in the country I organized a national survey on the quality of services based on a sample of health structures. This study enables us to evaluate the performance of the health units and their personnel. It is helping us in setting up norms and standards for the enhancement of quality.
- Norms and standards have changed to improve quality of services. We organized a seminar on quality of services at the national level with representatives from the Ministry of Health. We also gave attention to lower levels and decided to introduce CBD.
- I became aware that quality of services should also include the voluntary interruption of pregnancy. It should be available when family planning did not work well. I would like to redo the seminar.
- Especially after the seminar on the quality of services I introduced changes. It was a real new perception. The seminar allowed me to understand the concept and to identify elements which needed to be improved in our program. At our return from Boston we organized a seminar. We asked to apply new criteria of quality in our work especially in regard to the reception of the clients. We diffused new norms and we give priority to it in the training of personnel. Almost all procedures were changed. As a consequence the number of our clients increased substantially.

- The seminar on the quality of services has permitted me to correct many aspects of my program. I became interested in it and tried to participate in other seminars on the same topic. I now put more emphasis on quality of services when evaluating program results.
- The Boston seminar on quality of services made us aware of the many weaknesses in our program. The first thing we did was to set up a medical committee for quality of services.
- As a consequence of FRAC we introduced the following innovations in our country: strengthening of the management of the peripheral clinics, creation of management committees at the level of the community centers for service delivery, decentralization of the promotion of services through the establishment of "clubs of satisfied clients".
- Population policies and the official attitude towards family planning in my country started to change when I became a member of FRAC. So I cannot say that FRAC through me was the principal cause of the change. However my participation in the FRAC meetings enable me to point out to the government the importance of the quality of services and of supervision and to build in a strategy towards higher quality in my program.

E. Examples: Decentralization

- Once back we looked at the advantages and disadvantages of decentralization for our program. We also identified instances where decentralization should be avoided because of serious possibilities for chaos creation. On balance we ended up with a more decentralized system. Before, the management structures went directly from the central level to the village. We also realized that decentralization implies a lot of training and supervision.
- I am in charge of the national program and because of that I am very much interested in decentralization. We have to stress more intermediate levels. We discussed decentralization. We haven't finished but we have taken some decisions on all levels.
- When we became preoccupied with the extension of the family planning program to more than 300 health centers throughout the country, we realized that decentralization was absolutely indispensable for the extension of the program.

F. Examples: Support from the private sector and other segments of society

- I was able to do two things. I was able to increase the support of the private sector and to promote a feasibility study on how to better integrate the private sector into the national program. There is no doubt that the private sector has taken more importance. In addition I improved our supervision tools and made sure that the private sector is aware of the goals of the national program.

- The Kigali workshop has helped us to focus more on important opinion leaders from several sectors, such as the religious, including the traditional religious sector; trade unions; and the press. Seminars and other activities were organized for Voodoo priests, journalists, and trade union leaders. This has increased the awareness of the existence of our family planning organization. It has enabled us to take on leadership among other NGOs in the family planning area. We are now the best-known NGO in that field. Others from the same field have come to us to get technical support. We have definitely increased the sympathy of many people towards our movement.

G. Examples: Relations with donors

- Some of the plans of action formulated at the annual FRAC meetings helped us to submit more efficient proposals to USAID which subsequently were approved.
- FRAC made me more confident in negotiations with donors. Often, as a consequence of my participation in FRAC, I had the feeling that I had much clearer ideas about the desired structure and management forms.

All examples presented here are based on self reporting. Rigorous conclusions would require independent confirmation⁴. In a few cases, this was possible either through verifications in the limited number of FRAC countries where FRAC members were interviewed and/or through conversations with external observers. All together one can conclude that FRAC has had important benefits for the conduct of family planning programs in Francophone Africa and Haiti. The quality of these programs is improving. Managers are focusing much more on how integration of family planning into health services, better supervision, decentralization, support from the private sector, and attention to other quality enhancing measures can improve their programs. In a few cases FRAC participants have played an important role in the acceptance and legitimization of family planning.

IV. FORMAT OF FRAC

FRAC can be described as an informal network with the annual meeting at its core. The annual meeting is the heart of FRAC, transforming the network into a living organism and each year pumping new blood into the system. Therefore, to understand the beneficial outcomes of FRAC, we first need to better understand the mechanism and the methodology of the annual workshops and the field visits that are integral parts of the annual workshops. We also need to consider the communication activities that hum throughout the network during the inter-meeting periods. Focusing on these components—the workshop, the field visits, and the communication

⁴ See Annex 1 for important methodological remarks.

activities—will also allow us to discern some weaknesses in the FRAC program as perceived by the participants.

A. The annual meeting

The most important feature of the annual meeting, as perceived by the participants, is what they feel is the participatory nature penetrating the whole concept of FRAC—from the actual conduct of the annual meetings to the selection of the themes for these meetings. On the attendance of their first meeting, participants become very much aware that they are encountering unfamiliar, innovative pedagogy that stimulates the creative spirit. The experience of the workshop not only brings them into contact with important management themes for family planning programs but also with new training methodologies that they have subsequently introduced or plan to introduce into their own programs. Samples of general reactions demonstrating such impressions are presented in the following paragraphs.

- The method is participatory. This is an appropriate method for managers such as us. The attitudes of the facilitators favor maximum participation. Everyone can indicate his/her opinion. One is not afraid to express one's opinion. One feels in family. It is really a new method; one develops the spirit of listening to other opinions.
- I like the format (of the FRAC meeting) very much. The format doesn't impose things on you. And there are the facilitators who stimulate the exchange.
- It is a stimulating method. It stimulates reflection . The method is like producing an art work. It makes you feel you are an artist who collaborates in the production of a master piece. One should continue with the method.
- The method is very well adapted to our group as shown in the interaction between facilitators and participants. Participation makes the group more creative and allows the experience of the participants to come to the foreground.
- The method is really good. I have especially appreciated the fishbowl technique⁵ which really permitted the participants to develop their arguments. This is very important for program managers. The different parts of the meeting are logically very connected.
- FRAC is a real apprenticeship for me. It gives us a new focus to look at things. It turns you into a mountain climber who is always looking for the conquest of new approaches. We came into contact with a new pedagogic method and we are

⁵"Fishbowl" is a generic name for exercises wherein a small group works on a task surrounded by a larger group which observes how the smaller group does the task. This has been adapted for the FRAC to include debating exercises.

learning while doing things. It is really an example of appropriate technology! At the end of the meeting one realizes that one has produced quite a bit in a relaxed setting.

- One of the advantages of FRAC is the brainstorming. It gives one practical suggestions which can be applied immediately in one's own programs as for example is the case with political commitment which is so crucial for our countries. I have now a number of concrete suggestions for promoting political commitment to the idea of family planning.
- The FRAC methodology has pleased me very much. It is an interactive method but to be successful one needs to master the method very well and find the right time to use it. One shouldn't improvise. It is like a pyramid where the ideas emerge from a broad base and where the best solutions rise to the top.
- FRAC workshops are not courses. It makes you reflect on concepts, on notions which initially seem abstract. The facilitators make us talk and bring us towards solutions. One feels a mastery of the management of small groups. The facilitators understand the dynamics of small groups.
- The participatory method enables us to select the themes for the annual meetings in a consensual fashion. This enables better preparation and turns us into important sources of training.

Some participants explicitly referred to the Conakry workshop as an example of this experience:

- The Conakry meeting through its emphasis on participation has permitted managers to identify the parameters needed for the sustainability of their programs. It enabled us to quickly identify our weaknesses. It showed us that viability requires us to give more attention to how programs are conceived. In order for our activities to be viable we really need good program design.
- The Conakry meeting and its discussions in group and in the plenary has made us reflect. Often in negotiations with donors one neglects the complete range of the concept of viability. It is like facing a lion. One focuses on immediate survival and gets into a pattern of unilateral focus on financial aspects. One gets immobilized in the face of the lion. If one had a broader understanding of viability one would have better arms and a better chance to escape the starring eyes of the lion.

Box 3 The Logistics of FRAC

The organization of the annual FRAC meetings requires an enormous amount of logistic preparation by FPMD and the host country. Many persons, including the participants, are only barely aware of the scope of these preparations. Preparations start about 10 months before the approximate date of the meeting and require 50 full person-days of one person from FPMD who is responsible for the logistic coordination. Additional logistic work is done by many other persons at MSH and in the field. The process begins by contacting officials in the country that has been selected to host the conference. By June (assuming that the meeting itself is organized in November) there is a preparatory visit of the selected country by a small team of about two persons. This team meets with local people to settle various logistic aspects such as lodging, preliminary schedule for conference, method of communication, and division of labor between FPMD and the local hosts, site visits and many others. After the visit preparatory work based on the team's recommendations—which have been put together in a special report—continues. During June/July draft cables are sent to USAID missions requesting nominations of two participants per country. Potential candidates and members of CAs are contacted. Travel arrangements need to be made and regular contacts with the selected hotel need to be maintained to transmit information on number and names of participants. Finally a package is sent to each participant with an advance, plane ticket, letter of introduction, conference documents and information on the country. During this period important personnel issues requiring immediate solutions regularly crop up, such as arranging visas for people from countries where the host country does not have consular facilities. The person involved in the logistics of the conference will travel to the host country several days before the meeting. During the conference they will have their hands full in providing the necessary funds to pay hotel and other expenses, arrange for return reservation and solve a myriad of little problems which routinely emerge during such a meeting. Some of the evaluation questions dealt with logistics.

There is unanimous admiration for the logistics of the FRAC conferences and of the persons behind it. When there were problems it was normally recognized that they were beyond the control of FPMD. The only serious problem regularly but insistently brought up was in regard to the check for advances and for subsequent payments for hotel and other expenses. Some persons complained that local USAID had refused to cash the check for advances because they had not received the necessary approvals. Some participants had not been able to cash their checks before departure. Others complained about the long interval before these checks were cleared through their banking system while commissions were accumulating. In some cases exchange rates changed before travelers' checks could be cashed in local currency. Some persons, evidently unaware of the problems in bringing large amounts of cash from Boston would just prefer to receive cash in lieu of the checks. The payment system needs refinement.

Although the participants are generally very enthusiastic about the method, two strands of constructive criticism can be discerned in the interviews. One strand is predominantly found among newcomers to the program. It is a certain amount of bewilderment and disorientation with a new and unfamiliar method and a feeling of being hemmed in by participants with more experience with the FRAC meetings, a phenomenon also observed by some veterans. As a problem it is less important because many of the newcomers observe that the disorientation disappears as the meeting progresses and as they become more adept with the new methodology. Some of the newcomers even feel that the initial disorientation is an integral part of the method because it gives a useful dose of shock therapy. The other strand of constructive criticism is much

more important, and in mapping out the future of FRAC it needs serious attention. It should be emphasized that these critical observations are always given in a constructive spirit and after many very positive statements about the FRAC program. We start with examples of the first strand.

- Sometimes the method makes you think that you are groping (*tâtonner*) in the dark. For a certain time the method is not clear but things become clearer as time goes on.
- Sometimes the method does not give us full understanding of the direction towards where we are going. For the subgroups I would have liked more guidance (*encadrement*) of the facilitators. We were too much on our own. It dispersed the attention. I observed that once a new subject was introduced there were many questions, maybe because of a lack of concentration.
- The facilitators try not make anyone frustrated. I do think facilitators should direct more. People risk not to do the work which is expected from them because facilitators are not sufficiently demanding.
- At first I was very much surprised by the new method. I had the impression of disorder but little afterwards I realized that the methodology promoted a relaxed atmosphere and that the seminar became guided not only by the facilitators but also by the participants. There is a danger with the method that the older participants talk too much. More orientation is needed and more discipline. However, one has to recognize that the method stimulates originality which makes people leave downtrodden paths.
- The sequence of the sessions is very good and very logical. It does not hang in the air, although in the beginning it looked a bit like that.
- Sometimes I feel that the facilitators should make more efforts to promote participation of the newcomers. Some persons do not express themselves as easily as others. They feel like a gazelle in the face of a lion.
- Sometimes one is not clear where one goes and one gets the impression that the sessions are not well defined. One needs more precision as to where one is and where one goes. Sometimes I get the impression that facilitators let people talk too much and that more direction is needed for synthesis and summary. There are problems of time management in comparison with the objectives of the workshop. Sometimes time rationing should be used for some participants. The facilitators have to play more the role of a train conductor and be firm in giving the signals for departure and stops.
- As a newcomer I have some problems because I am still not completely clear about the objective of the meeting. Is its objective the evaluation of our activities or is it the orientation of the decision makers? The method is still too much in a flux for me. The term "Plan of Action", to indicate the product of the meeting is a cause of confusion in

my mind. Are we supposed to be the only authority to decide on a plan of action. We are not really in a position to do that. I'm very curious to see tomorrow's plan of action.

- Sometimes the method looks a bit blurred. Some of the proposed themes seem a bit hazy and it is difficult to grasp them in their entirety. However after a period of fogginess it is becoming clearer to me as was the case with the search of indicators [for viability] which finally created a clearer orientation.
- The explanations for the exercises sometimes are not clear. There is no follow-up at the level of the groups to remedy the incomprehension."
- Still, in spite of the interactive method, some participants remain a bit inactive. Some are silent because they are afraid to say something. We need approaches to elicit their reactions.
- While reflecting on certain concepts one sometimes gets the impression that they are not well formulated. One has problems to assimilate them. It is complicated for newcomers. One probably needs more pedagogic instruments (such as slides) and concrete examples to clearly demonstrate the usefulness of the new concepts. However I am aware that I am new to the methodology which although still unclear to me also challenges me to look at things from unexpected angles.

Participants who have been involved in more than one FRAC meeting, and especially in a series, give a definite indication that they would welcome more substance to the seminars. Again, we give examples. Some participants—a minority—blame the method for a perceived lack of substance. The majority of the veterans feel that the method should be kept or adjusted but that more efforts should be directed to the transfer of substantial knowledge and robust expertise.

- Sometimes I am thirsty for more substantial stuff. One sometimes wishes more depth. The method for the first time was excellent. But now it becomes a bit repetitious. Always the same actors! Methodology has to be diversified. In pedagogy there are many different methods. Some methods can be repeated such as brainstorming but ways have to be found to couple the methodology with the introduction of more content matter.
- The participatory method has a reverse side too. Everyone seems to be right. We are not sufficiently critical towards each other. The facilitators never criticize us. They should do so to enrich us. We are considered instantaneous experts in every domain but we are not. Although debates are very active one would welcome some order in it. Sometimes one would welcome a more theoretical perspective in it. It would be good to have an international expert in the subject matter of the seminar here even if s/he is here only for a few days."

- We say that everyone is an expert. I wish that there was some formal course part of the program which could add to our theoretical knowledge and provide us with material to which one can continuously refer."
- The participatory method is good but sometimes one gets the impression that everything passes, that all ideas are OK.
- In some way the participatory method is very directed. There is really no time for in-depth discussion. Methodology is sometimes favored to the detriment of substance and then sometimes there is as a dilution of the theme.
- The facilitators are always the same. Sometimes I ask myself whether it would not be advisable to include a real specialist on the theme who is familiar with the theme. They tell us we are all facilitators but this does not come always out very well.
- It is always the same persons who participate in the FRAC meetings. It is the same persons who guide the discussions. The same persons means the same song. It is a beautiful song but one wishes more variety in the musical airs.
- One critique that I have is that the facilitators let you talk very much but that there is not enough feedback. The second critique that I have is that in spite of much brainstorming there haven't been that many new ideas. Everything which has been mentioned are ideas with which we have worked for several years. We need new ideas. There should be more stimulation for new ideas. The FRAC forums have been extremely useful to me but we should deepen the reflection.
- The facilitators seem not to have concrete practical experience of the problem. Hence the conclusions are missing in specificity. The facilitators are sometimes overburdened (débordé) by the participants.
- It would be useful to have some kind of training more strongly present in the meeting. One assumes that every participant knows about the topic. It would be good to have an expert in the subject matter at the meeting. It would make the contents of the meeting richer.
- As an old timer of FRAC I know all the steps by heart. They have taken me to new insights. But there is a need to combine this method with other methods. The participatory method though makes one participate and therefore should not be discarded.
- The facilitators are people who do not come with granite solutions and that is a positive asset of the meetings. They really involve us, as managers with experience, in the solutions to problems towards which the meetings are directed. However sometimes the facilitators do not know how far they should let the individuals

expose their opinions which then become somewhat vacuous and repetitious. It is difficult to reconcile both points.

- Participation can end up in too many discussions. Many global ideas are being launched but there is not enough precision. For example in this meeting I am curious to know how clients were convinced to pay for the services they received.
- Sometimes too much time is spent on the ideas of the participants. All programs do not have the same level of development. Some programs are more advanced than others. Maybe some persons with more experience and expertise could be selected from the audience as additional facilitators.
- If more substance was introduced in the annual meetings, it would be easier to come up with useful instruments which then could be described in a synthetic document, to be eventually published during the inter-meeting period.

Some participants thought that this fault was more present in the Conakry meeting on sustainability than in previous meetings:

- Viability is an important theme but the theme has not been sufficiently discussed in depth. One needs new ideas. Technicians plan in their offices but in the field one has to plan with illiterates. Facilitators should have stressed this aspect more strongly.
- For the theme of viability it would be good to have presentations with a somewhat more formal framework. It is good to determine the concept and to prepare a plan of action. We reviewed all the factors which are needed for a viable program. It would be desirable to introduce some more theoretical and technical notions and how to apply them in what conditions. We should give a bit more space to technicians who have confronted similar problems. The model of developed countries can be useful but we also need scientific treatment of the problems of developing countries. People from the U.S. pass through our countries and they consider everything from the U.S. point of view and think that issues of viability have to be solved within a U.S. mold.
- We did not go into detail. There was no time to go into detail or into depth. Viability contents were too short. We really overviewed everything meaningful in viability, but superficially. For viability we would have liked to have more tools and to do the analysis of a particular experience.
- I thought that the meeting on viability was less interesting than others. There were not enough case studies. Decentralization became more pertinent because we were in closer contact with real examples.
- No new and original ideas to really change the situation emerged during the Conakry seminar. All the ideas presented are already well known. No concrete

proposals emerged. We remained with common generalities (généralités de toujours)!

- No new plans, strategy, or practical approach really emerged from the seminar to make programs really viable. No standard tool emerged from the meeting which really would help us in evaluating the degree and the nature of the viability of our programs. We really do not have concrete ideas about the means to obtain viability.
- What the discussions during the seminar brought out at least is that the theme of viability is more confused than I first thought. The term itself has a certain amount of ambivalence. Viability for the immediate future is like saying: This fetus is viable. Viability has been considered too much as already guaranteed. Probably more reference documents should have been distributed at the beginning which should have been the subject of in-depth discussion.
- Countries should have presented their experiences in more depth. The experience of Haiti was well presented because it showed how the program had been able to survive in the face of the deep political crisis through which the country was passing. In general the relation between the economic situation and viability problems of family planning programs should have been discussed in more detail.

The first type of problem—a certain sense of bewilderment—is unavoidable and, as mentioned, reflects the normal, and maybe even desired, reaction in the face of new and eye-catching methodology. However, it may be useful to explain the methodology a bit more in detail at the start of the meeting: its steps, its logical sequence and its interrelations with the principal goals of the meeting and of the FRAC network in general. Some persons made additional suggestions: "maybe give a bit more time to the groups because in these groups individuals tend to express themselves more easily; give some theoretical notions of group dynamics; more evaluation of ongoing activities during the meeting; show very clearly the objective of each section of the meeting." The suggestion to give more time to small group discussions should be weighed carefully, though, as the following comments show: "small groups can wander about and need more guidance; the discussions within and between groups sometimes creates more confusion; small groups are occasionally dominated by certain persons and block the involvement of other persons; one should economize on the number of groups and on the time allocated to small groups so that there is more time for formal presentations."

The comments in regard to the second problem show a definite desire for more substantive inputs into the workshop, more solid foundations, more theoretical perspectives on management principles, sturdier knowledge about concrete applications, more variation in the type of facilitators, and the preparation of a synthetic common document at the end of the meeting. The second type of problem, as already emphasized, needs serious attention in any rethinking of the program, and some suggestions towards its solution will be presented in the conclusions of this evaluation report.

B. Field visits

All FRAC workshops include field visits. Participants are divided into a number of small groups, corresponding to the number of sites to be visited. The selected sites represent a variety of situations pretty well covering the whole country. Although these field visits take up a small proportion of the overall time reserved for the whole workshop, they are a very important component of the program. Before leaving for the field visits, participants inventory and discuss the important items on which they will focus during the field visits. Once back each group makes its own report. Subsequently, the reports are discussed in a joint meeting of all the groups, allowing for much interchange of impressions and suggestions for important lessons. Furthermore, the experience of the field visits crops up regularly in the subsequent discussions of the seminar. The field visits are therefore an integral part of the seminar. As one participant said: "Without the field visits the seminar is like an elephant without its tusks. What we discuss at the workshop gets only staying power because we can relate it to concrete experiences." Another participant concluded that "The field visits really let you know much better the realities of the real world. They enable the 'fraceurs' to be impregnated by the richness of the field."

During the last FRAC workshop, the field visits acquired an additional orientation, as several participants observed during the discussions on their return. As one of the participants pointed out: "Guinea, through our presence at the workshop in Conakry and through our suggestions and recommendations on the base of our field visits, has the benefit of an informal evaluation mission of the kind conducted by USAID, UNFPA or the World Bank." Participants from Guinea recognized this benefit and, judging from the discussions, amply profited from this new orientation. Indeed this new orientation should be further exploited in subsequent FRAC meetings and be built more systematically into the FRAC experience. Recommendations seem to be more readily accepted because they come from African colleagues who are very much confronted by common problems. This is confirmed by letters from Guinea, sent to MSH in the aftermath of the Conakry meeting: "Your [field] visit has taught us many things. In place of disturbing our normal activities it has deepened our knowledge and we would have wished that you could have stayed longer for the benefit of our personnel." Another letter: "Your [field] visit has left us with a good aftertaste and has given new flavor to all our activities. Your presence as a team has reverberated in the whole city. Those who were not able to meet with the team would like to have had direct contact with you, both because of the diverse nature of your team and the questions asked by your team."

It is to be expected that participants, in the face of limited time spent in the field, will make suggestions which logistically cannot be met or can only be met with difficulty. Most participants are aware of this, and they recognize that the imperative of fitting the visits into an already busy program introduces almost inescapable limitations, and that extending the visits might impinge on other essential components of the program. But even under these circumstances, field visits are considered very useful. Among most participants, there is therefore a tension between the desire to acquire more in-depth experience from the field visits and the awareness that the workshop cannot go on indefinitely. Generally participants would like to see more time allocated to the

field visits (4 to 5 days is the modal answer). As one participant said, with some exaggeration: "The field visits should last longer because now one almost goes through the selected areas as a tourist."

Other participants, as an alternative to extending the field visits, make proposals that in their opinions could make the field visits more productive. Examples of statements of this nature are the following:

- I wish that participants had more time to conduct some personal investigations during the field visits. There is a tendency to guide us. We almost feel like becoming a herd of antelopes.
- One could not really talk to the clients. Better time management is needed for the visits.
- Site visits have to be structured better. Their objectives and instruments (presumably the way they are conducted) need to be better enunciated.
- Field visits need to teach you more about the culture and customs of the population, especially those aspects which are relevant to the application of health and family planning programs. A little bit more information should be given on those aspects before departing for the field.
- In the Tunis meeting there was one week of sessions before we went into the field. Here in Guinea we went to the field in the middle of the first week and I felt less prepared.
- Local hosts should be prepared better for the site visits. They should know very well why we are visiting them. Our discussion with the local hosts sometimes tended to wander about because they were not sufficiently aware of our specific interests."

A minority of participants expressed concerns that those in the field might present false fronts, as the following two statements show:

- One is too much organized during field visits. In Africa in such conditions people always fabricate theater scenery. What one sees is not the complete reality.
- I have a question. Are the conclusions resulting from the site visits biased because maybe our hosts selected the better sites?

One person expressed the opposite danger:

- Some people profit from the passage of strangers to report particular personal problems which they never mentioned to their superiors. So we can get wrong impressions. I mistrust visits but it is still good to discuss things with the masses.

Some participants would like to see the experience of the field trips even more integrated in the annual meeting as shown by the following statement:

- The field visits gave us so much material. They made us think of so many problems that we encounter in our own countries. The preparatory meeting prior to the visits is a must because it made us focus on certain aspects that we might have easily neglected without it. In general I would like to see the remainder of the meeting give far more time and attention to an in-depth discussion of what we observed during the visits. Making these visits now is like a bird-of-prey, suddenly swooping from the skies but then forgetting what the bird does with its prey.

C. Communication during the inter-meeting periods

FRAC is a network with a high degree of intercommunication among members and with FPMD/Boston during a short period of the year on the occasion of the annual meeting. For the remainder of the year, there is no formal communication with FPMD/Boston except for the sending of some reports concerning the FRAC meeting and a midyear annual phone call. Most participants though, provided they notify FPMD of changes in address, will regularly receive the publications of MSH/FPMD. Occasionally staff members from MSH, while visiting a country for other than FRAC business, may try to contact FRAC members. Regarding communication among FRAC members, except for some New Year Cards and a chance encounter in the same meeting, there is not much communication.

There is, therefore, generally not much communication and interchange in the inter-meeting periods. Participants in general would welcome more communication during these inter-meeting periods and made several suggestions. Some of these such as the publication of a full-fledged newsletter, extensive mutual visits, and a permanent secretariat to organize the contacts would require extensive resources and do not seem to be realistic. Other suggestions are more feasible—such as the stimulation of a document circuit in two directions with Boston and among the participants and participation in the editorial committee of management manuals and of the management newsletter. Participants are especially interested in mechanisms which could "valorize the experience of countries which are ahead of us" as one FRAC member put it. Some participants see increased inter-meeting communication as one of the remedies to compensate for the perceived insufficient substance of the annual meetings: "Viability is a very interesting theme and when I return to my country I want to apply the cost recovery system of Guinea. My question is, is that the only way of talking of viability? Are there other countries which could be used as a point of reference and in comparison with Guinea? Are there other worthwhile strategies in the area of viability? I wish FRAC had some kind of mechanism which could provide us this information." Another person puts it more bluntly: "We thought Guinea had plenty of experience

but this is not completely the case. So it would be helpful if FRAC during the inter-meeting periods could supply this information." Many participants were very much impressed at the Conakry meeting by the experience of Haiti and how they had been able to survive during a very difficult political period and would like to receive more information on it in the form of a case study.

V. THE FUTURE OF FRAC

Participants were also interviewed about whether FRAC should continue to exist and if so what the future shape of FRAC should be. All FRAC members interviewed expressed very strong preferences for the continued existence of FRAC. As one FRAC member stated: "I cannot imagine life without FRAC. I cannot imagine family planning in Francophone Africa without FRAC. FRAC should not terminate because it has become a network of discussions and decisions, essential for the promotion of family planning. Many aspects of family planning programs are still underdeveloped. FRAC still has a lot to do in the improvement of the management of our programs."

As to what the future shape of FRAC should be, the majority wants some changes in format. With open questions, many opinions—some of them very divergent and sometimes contradictory—were expressed. We briefly review some of the answers. They have been classified in seven themes: institutionalization, functions, membership, role and nature of the annual meeting, preparation of the annual meetings, follow-up and communication, relations with similar efforts of other agencies, and relations with the donor community.

A. Institutionalization of FRAC

Some participants would like to see FRAC receive a much more defined institutional character with a permanent secretariat, a regular news bulletin, and a board with members of the participating countries. Most participants, however, thought that a fully autonomous structure would make FRAC more heavy than desirable and therefore expressed a desire for a smaller degree of formal institutionalization. They thought this lower degree of formal institutionalization would be useful in intensifying inter-meeting communication and in enabling the network to monitor activities resulting from the annual meetings and to provide some degree of technical assistance to these activities. Some participants even suggested the establishment of a small committee within FRAC that could visit FRAC countries to check and monitor progress made by programs or program changes introduced as a consequence of FRAC and to give concrete advice to countries regarding the topics of the FRAC meetings. However, at the same time they prefer FRAC's flexible nature and they also realize the fund raising problems inherent in a full fledged institutionalization of FRAC.

At the Conakry meeting, the future of FRAC was one of the topics explicitly discussed. The idea of the Centre for African Family Studies (CAFS) as a potential institution to house FRAC was discussed. A CAFS representative gave a description of the organization and its purpose,

structure, activities, and its possible role as the future manager of FRAC. The idea of attaching FRAC to CAFS was very well-received. It will constitute (raccrocher) the base for further efforts to transfer the management of FRAC to Africa.

B. Functions of FRAC

Some persons would like to see FRAC take on a prestigious role at a high level of political impact, in a way be the official spokesperson for family planning interests in Francophone Africa. As one participant says: "One has to continue absolutely with the network, with this type of meeting. But FRAC should play a more open political role. I developed a supervision model for my country but would need more political support to execute it." Another member feels that: "One has to give a more clear-cut identity to FRAC. It needs more international recognition."

Many FRAC members would like to see FRAC taking on more bridge functions between Anglophone and Francophone Africa: "FRAC is a closed circle. We would like to have some sessions on Anglophone countries where contraceptive acceptance is much higher than in our countries. We should invite some experts from Anglophone Africa."

C. Membership in FRAC

Membership in FRAC is informal. There are no special procedures to be accepted as a FRAC member. It is enough to attend one annual meeting to be considered a member of the FRAC network. However several persons would like to see more attention given to the criteria used to select the participants for the regular annual meetings.

Some participants would like to have more persons who are politically influential as the following statement indicates: "The criteria for the evaluation and selection of persons attending the FRAC seminar have to be made more rigorous. We need more persons who have political weight." Another statement along the same lines: "It would be worthwhile to identify one or two political personalities, known for their favorable positions and invite them to FRAC."

Most of the participants welcomed the mix of FRAC membership: "Certain members have a more political role, others a more technical role. Provided there is a balance it is good to have such a mixture." Some felt that more care should be taken to guarantee at least the presence of a senior manager from each participating country at the annual meetings. Typical in this regard is the following statement of a newcomer: "The FRAC meeting is really fascinating. It is giving me a host of new ideas for our program. I wish my executive director had accompanied me. It would be then easier to apply the new ideas." A small minority felt that there should be more homogeneity among the FRAC members as the following two statements show. The first statement pleads in favor of 'hierarchical position' homogeneity: "It is very important that participants of FRAC are all from the same level of management." The other statement pleads in favor of more stability in the persons attending the annual meetings: "There are frequent changes

in the persons who attend the annual meetings. It is always a new learning process to make their acquaintance and to familiarize them with the FRAC philosophy."

Some persons even feel that more countries could be added to the network: "The Afro-Lusitanian countries should be included⁶. They could enormously benefit from it. They probably do not yet have an inkling of how to go about family planning."

D. Role and nature of the annual meeting

Most of the participants continue to see the annual meeting as the core of FRAC (See Box 4 for some information on themes for future meetings.) One FRAC member puts it as follows: "The annual meeting is the most important thing. I always come back from the annual meeting knowing what I want to do. To meet with each other is the important thing. I do not think the news bulletin is indispensable or very important. It would be welcomed but it is not necessary." However many of them feel that the annual meetings should change somewhat in character, as is clear from the previous discussion on the format of the meeting (pp. 10-20). In addition, they feel that besides the annual meeting there are some other tasks that need to be done. One example: "FRAC needs to be modified and diversified. Meetings on population grow faster than population. Meetings are OK but they need to be transcended. We need a forum, a kind of workshop to develop instruments for our programs. We are backwards in comparison with our Anglophone colleagues. Many of the guides and manuals for family planning are in English and therefore not known and not really very useful in Francophone Africa. We should meet together to launch manuals for example on MIS systems for family planning or on the role of NGO's in family planning."

Some FRAC members recommend that the annual meetings should be used to make a short number of key recommendations which should then be delivered to the political leaders of the FRAC countries. Others recommend the compilation of a report which should be sent to the Minister of Health and to the department heads responsible for health and family planning programs, especially when they have had one of their staff members attend the annual meeting.

⁶ I do not think FRAC could successfully include these countries, both because of language problems and because of cultural and political differences rooted in their colonization histories. However, a smaller version of the FRAC, specifically for these countries and with participation from family planning organizations in Brazil, could make a successful duplication of FRAC's experience.

Box 4 Themes for the annual meetings

As mentioned before the themes of the annual FRAC meetings are selected by the participants themselves. At the meeting in Conakry the following themes and countries were provisionally selected by FRAC members for the next six years:

1995	Community Participation (Benin)
1996	Community Based Distribution (Mali)
1997	Advanced Strategies (Haiti)
1998	Integration (Niger or Burkina Faso)
1999	Intersectoral Collaboration (Madagascar)
2000	Program Development (Zaire)

During the evaluation interviews, participants were queried about their personal theme preferences. The answers reflect growing sophistication of the FRAC members, as the following suggestions for themes show: strategic planning; types of indicators essential for family planning programs; intersectoral collaboration for family planning programs; does charging for services help in sustainability; community participation and political commitment as a foundation for sustainability; costing of human resources systems; integration of family planning in health services; training of trainers; training of program managers; urban family planning strategies; computers, management and family planning; how to really profit from evaluation; improvements of MIS systems; evaluation performance of personnel; management of services at the level of the clinic or local health post, including the collection of reliable data at the local level; family planning programs and reproductive health of adolescents; gender, reproductive health and sexual mutilation; decentralization of specific subjects such as training, supervision and logistic management. Many participants emphasized that in selecting the country where the annual meeting will be organized all care should be exercised that in the selected country the theme really should have received priority attention.

Other participants think more time should be dedicated to the evaluation of the previous FRAC meeting and its impact on the programs of the different countries. Newcomers, especially, find themselves a little disoriented by the rather short reference to the previous year's FRAC meeting as the following statement shows: "I am a newcomer to FRAC. I was expecting much from the evaluation of FRAC of last year. Only one hour was dedicated to it during which some countries talked of their improvements in supervision. It was not concretely indicated how the improvements were organically related to the FRAC seminar." Some veterans would even like to see some of the themes repeated, but with a full scale discussion of the evaluation of what was done in the aftermath of the meeting in the various FRAC countries.

There is a major split among the participants in regard to one of the products of the annual meeting. About half of the participants feel that more attention should be given to the preparation of a workplan which can be submitted to the government and outside donors, and which would be monitored by and receive technical assistance from FRAC. The other half feel that the focus on a workplan is illusory because "in most cases it is just impossible to get funding for these work plans." A case in point is the following statement: "FRAC should not set out to formulate a plan of action for each country but should answer questions such as the following: what is a minimum

list of appropriate indicators for family planning programs in Francophone Africa; what type of partnership to develop between the government and NGO's; what are the viability characteristics of a family planning program in the concrete situation and future conditions of a Francophone country. Another statement along the same lines: "Plans of action are difficult to insert into ongoing programs. Better focus on important strategic issues."

E. Preparation of FRAC annual meetings

Some participants felt that the annual meetings should be subject to more intense preparation in which the participating countries are more involved. They thought that there should be a system enabling FPMD staff members and selected persons from the FRAC network to go to the field about three to four months before the seminar to conduct a micro assessment of activities related to the future theme and to obtain feedback for the new seminar. This, according to the same persons, would make it possible to present more in-depth case studies based on the concrete experience of the member countries. Others thought that the participants should come to the annual meeting with a document describing what they had done to implement the recommendations of the previous meeting and what they thought were the most problematic areas related to the current meeting theme. Some even suggested that every member country of FRAC should set up a small committee that would regularly convene in preparation of the FRAC meeting and which would review experiences related to the theme of the upcoming meeting.

F. Follow-up and communication

Where there was undoubtedly the largest amount of agreement was in the need for more follow-up of the annual meeting. As one participant states: "We would like to see more monitoring on the part of the sponsoring agency (i.e., FPMD) during the inter-meeting period. We still don't have enough support for our work during the inter-meeting period. We want the organizing committee of FRAC more involved in our work. We should set up a 'MINIFRAC' in each country. It could review the theme of the annual meeting and together with a representative of MSH look at opportunities for applications in our own country." Many persons indeed expressed the desire that somehow MSH should find some persons who would travel regularly through the FRAC countries, visit FRAC members, study possibilities for transforming the plans of action formulated at the annual FRAC meeting into real programs and evaluate any such plans of action. Typical in this regard is the following statement: "One would have wished that someone from MSH, would have come—such as Sylvia⁷—in the post-meeting period. Direct contact would have given more life to the messages of FRAC. We will be more interested in applying things if there is follow up. One has discussed the idea of a news bulletin but it has never been done. FRAC members should be asked to send reports on what they have done as a

⁷ Refers to Sylvia Vriesendorp, one of the main organizers of the FRAC meetings. When I interviewed FRAC members in their own countries, several expressed their pleasant surprise at seeing a person from FPMD coming to look at their program.

consequence of the FRAC meetings." Some persons emphasized that a newsletter (bulletin de liaison) could play an important role in assuring that FRAC members learn about the status of the introduction of new ideas in the FRAC countries as a consequence of the annual meetings⁸. Others, however, feel that printed matter is insufficient as a means of follow-up: "We would like to get more than just printed information. We would like to have observers to look at our work." FRAC members appreciate the annual phone calls from FPMD regarding the status of action plan implementation but feel this is insufficient as follow-up.

G. FRAC and similar efforts of other agencies in Francophone Africa

Few persons brought up this issue, but those who did had some clear suggestions to make. These are very well-summarized by an outside observer: "Several agencies working in Francophone Africa have developed some activities which are similar to those of FRAC. MSH has been able to maintain and develop FRAC better than other agencies. It would be good to recognize this openly and put these efforts together within the framework of FRAC. Dispersed but similar efforts is a waste of resources. The same personnel gets mobilized. It is difficult for the same persons to participate in all these activities and meetings which often deal with the same subject matter. At the same time, one could economize on the number of meetings. It is like milling the same grain three, four times through the same mills."

H. FRAC and the donor community

Subjects of answers range from tactics to whom to approach. Many participants thought FRAC should do more to strengthen its image. Comments such as the following illustrate this point: we have to sell FRAC to the donors; we have to make an attractive folder to explain FRAC; we have to organize a systematic campaign among the donor community; we need to have a document which describes in detail the nature of the FRAC network systems and its activities; FRAC organizers should send a report on the FRAC meeting to the donor community in the member countries of FRAC with suggestions for the activities to which they could contribute.

Some participants expressed their frustration with these traditional approaches, as the following statement shows: "It is really paradoxical. We are here at a meeting to discuss strategies to become less dependent on traditional donors and look we are walking the same path to the traditional donors to seek the continued survival of FRAC." While some would like to continue preferentially with USAID the large majority realized that this was not feasible and not even desirable. Many were in agreement that individual countries should seek support from their own governments, at least for travel money to attend the annual meetings. Some people felt that far more attention should be directed to a well-thought-out plan for the future of FRAC that could be submitted to the donors and also guide family planning activities of FRAC members. Others

⁸ A newsletter may need too many resources but the suggestion to insert a page with news on FRAC in the French version of *The Family Planning Manager*, as one participant suggested, deserves consideration.

thought that the flexible nature of FRAC network militated against good possibilities for support and that more institutionalization, coordination, and permanent structures would facilitate future funding for FRAC. Those who opt strongly in favor of a plan of action as one of the end products feel that it should be aggressively sold to the donor community and that those who have been successful in selling their plan of action should be given prominence in a newsletter—or by some means—with a full report on how they did it.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

At a stage where FRAC is at a crossroads in its existence, several important conclusions can be drawn from its evaluation. First, FRAC has been shown to be a very successful project. Second, the FRAC experience has demonstrated at the same time that it is possible to establish a very informal but important network with a minimum of heavy structures. Third, FRAC, because of its success, is now at an important stage in its development during which important decisions will have to be made on its future format.

*FRAC is a very successful project.*⁹ FRAC has brought into existence a sense of a family planning community where before there was only fragmentation of interests in a very difficult environment. FRAC is a forum of exchange among persons with the same interests in family planning programs. FRAC is an important mechanism for knowledge transfer in the management of family planning programs and related health services. Furthermore, FRAC is having an important impact on the conduct of family planning programs in Francophone Africa through improvements in management.

The experience of FRAC has shown that *it is possible to establish a very informal but important network* to help legitimize family planning in a region where until recently family planning was taboo and continues to be a controversial issue in several segments of the society, to strengthen the organization and management of family planning and health programs, and to bring family planning managers into contact with new management thinking in health and family planning. It seems that the combination of a crisis situation—or at least a situation in which a particular issue is very controversial—with the presence of highly motivated persons creates environmental conditions in which technical assistance can flourish and be very effective without the need for permanent institutional structures, resident advisers, and other paraphernalia of technical assistance bureaucracy¹⁰.

⁹As of April 1995, nine FRAC members previously funded by FPMD have obtained independent financial support to attend the next meeting. This is undoubtedly one of the best indicators of success for FRAC and will probably make it possible to organize another FRAC meeting in 1995.

¹⁰ The Center for Applied Research on Population and Development (CERPOD) is another instance in which the combination of a crisis situation and the presence of highly skilled and motivated persons made the type of assistance provided by FPMD very successful.

FRAC is now at an important stage in its development during which important decisions will have to be made. First, there is the transition from FPMD sponsorship to sponsorship by CAFS, an African agency. For the first years, this will require strong technical support and logistic assistance from FPMD. Second, there is the need to search for alternative sources to fund the activities of FRAC. Third, the results of the evaluation report unambiguously point to the need for rethinking the format of the annual meetings and some of the other aspects of FRAC. This conclusion agrees with the suggestions of the participants given at the end of the Conakry meeting. These suggestions express a desire to see the annual meeting transformed into a workshop which provides more theoretical and practical instruments for solving the problems surrounding the selected theme for the workshop. Fourth, FRAC should give more attention to simple mechanisms for more active contacts and interaction during the inter-meeting periods. Fifth, measures should be taken for easier and quicker penetration of the program by the ideas resulting from the annual workshops and the inter-meeting contacts. If adequate attention is given to these five points the seventh FRAC meeting will go into history not as the departure point for a crisis, but as an opportunity for its renewal as a key component in the family planning milieu of Francophone Africa.

As the evaluation reports shows, FRAC members have many suggestions for the future of FRAC. For several of them there is large unanimity. For others there exist very divergent opinions that cannot be executed simultaneously. It is recommended here that the future format be the subject of a full day meeting at the next FRAC meeting and that a concise document be prepared for this day of discussion, based in part on a systematic overview of the suggestions which have emerged from the evaluation interviews and their implications.

ANNEX 1

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this evaluation is qualitative. It is based on semi-structured interviews with three categories of persons: FRAC participants, FRAC operators, and external observers from donor and collaborative agencies who are knowledgeable about FRAC. The semi-structured interviews dealt with the following topics:

1. Relevant personal information: professional background, career development, experience with family planning programs, participation in health and family planning meetings and courses.
2. Logistic aspects of the annual meetings: daily program, accommodation, financial and travel arrangements.
3. Participation in FRAC meetings and their impressions in regard to format of the network and of the annual meetings, the relevance of the theme selected for the annual meeting, the quality of the sessions, the role of the field visits.
4. Impact of FRAC annual meetings and network on population policies and improvement of family planning programs.
5. Follow-up activities in the aftermath of the annual meeting. Interchange and communication with other FRAC members during and after annual meetings.
6. Suggestions for future shape and activities of FRAC.

Existing documents and reports on FRAC, including evaluation reports of past FRAC meetings and the Conakry meeting were used for this evaluation report. They are listed in Annex 3. Participants at the Conakry meeting were also asked to write one page on each of the following themes: "Impact of FRAC on the Program in which I am Personally Involved" and "The Future of FRAC."

Most of the interviewees (see Annex 3 for a list of the interviewees) were interviewed on the occasion of the FRAC meeting in Conakry, Guinea. An effort, however, was made to interview a portion of FRAC members (member defined as someone who had participated in at least one FRAC meeting) in their countries of residence and their places of work. By doing so it was possible to obtain more concrete information on their work setting, on what had been changed under the impact of FRAC and on the obstacles faced in their work. This was done with members from Mali, Senegal, Togo and Burkina Faso.

As with any method, this one is not free from possible biases. A substantial part of the information is based on the information derived from the interviews. There are especially two dangers involved in this method: social desirability response sets* and self promotion response

* A response set refers to the phenomenon that for certain types of questions, respondents in social surveys tend to answer not according to its contents, but according to other criteria such as the desire to give answers which are thought to make the interviewer happy (social desirability response set) or to promote one's own image

sets. The danger of these response sets is greater for certain questions than for others. The self promotion response set is especially operational for questions on the impact of FRAC on members' activities in regard to population policies and family planning activities. The danger of social desirability response set is especially present for questions dealing with judgments about FPMD's role and future plans for FRAC.

Many efforts have been made to reduce the operation of these response sets. It was emphasized that all information would be kept confidential and that names of interviewees would never be associated in the evaluation report or elsewhere with their opinions and suggestions, that the Evaluation Unit of FPMD is completely external to FPMD's programs, and that critical and negative comments were especially valued because it allowed for identification of aspects the program which could be improved, one of the major goals of evaluation.

All the interviews were conducted in French. Many extracts from the statements of the interviewees are reproduced in the text. In doing so an effort has been made to retain some of the original color of the language. Occasionally the original French term is given between brackets because it was considered more meaningful. Also the use of metaphors which is more common in African languages and cultures is sometimes reflected in the French answers and has been retained in the translated version of the answers.

In citing literal answers of the respondents, two criteria have been used. Most of the answers reflect typical points of view and thus reflect the majority opinion. In several cases minority or less recurrent opinions have been cited as well, because they may express important points of view or show new angles. This is always clearly indicated in the text. It should also be emphasized that in explicitly inviting criticisms and suggestions for future activities, many contradictory opinions will be registered, occasionally even from the same person.

ANNEX 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

FPMD REPORTS

English

Madden, Claire; Sylvia Vriesendorp and Sallie Craig Huber. "FRAC IV: A Qualitative Assessment," November 1993.

Vriesendorp, Sylvia; Bula-Bula LieLie; Ralph Stone and Claire Madden. "FRAC V: Decentralizing Family Planning Programs, Rwanda," October 1992.

French

LieLie, Bula-Bula; Ralph Stone and Sylvia Vriesendorp. "Rapport sur la Quatrième Réunion du Comité Consultatif Régional Francophone (FRAC IV)," August 1991.

Vriesendorp, Sylvia; Bula-Bula LieLie; Ralph Stone and Claire Madden. "FRAC V - La Décentralisation des Programmes de Planification Familiale aux Populations Dispersées, Rwanda," October 1992.

Vriesendorp, Sylvia; Bula-Bula LieLie and Ralph Stone. "FRAC VII - La Viabilité des Programmes de Planification Familiale," November 1994.

Vriesendorp, Sylvia; Bula-Bula LieLie; Ralph Stone and Claire Madden. "FRAC VI - L'Institutionnalisation de la Supervision des Programmes de Planification Familiale, Tunisie," December 1993.

Vriesendorp, Sylvia. "Rapport de Mission sur la Préparation de la VI^{ème} Réunion du Comité FRAC en Tunisie," July 1993.

FPMT REPORTS

English

Engelberg, Gary and Lillian Baer with Al Hassane Diahate. "Rapport de la Troisième Réunion du Comité Consultatif Régional Francophone (FRAC), Dakar Senegal," March 1989.

"Report of the First Meeting of the Francophone Regional Advisory Committee (FRAC), Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A.," April 1987.

"Study Observation Tour to Jamaica and Mexico for the Francophone Regional Advisory Committee," April 1987.

French

Bulletin Technique 1, No. 1 (Fevrier 1988).

Bulletin Technique 1, No. 2 (Novembre 1988).

"Compte Rendu de la Première Réunion du Comité Consultatif Régional Francophone (FRAC),
Boston, Etats-Unis," April 1987.

"Réunion du Comité Consultatif Régional Francophone, Marrakech, Morocco," Avril 1988.

ANNEX 3

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

GUINEA

Dr. Mohammed ABOU-OUAKIL (Morocco)
Mr. Paul AGODIO (Cote d'Ivoire)
Mr. Francis AVODAGBE (Benin)
Mrs. Gisèle BALMIR (Haiti)
Dr. Ahmed BELTAIEF (Tunisia)
Prof. BULA BULA Lielie (MHP)
Dr. Mamadi CONDE (Guinea)
Dr. Hady DIALLO (Guinea)
Dr. Abdoulaye GUEYE (Senegal)
Dr. Setou KABA (Guinea)
Dr. Fatoumata KANTE (PSI)
Dr. Nassira KEDDAD (Algeria)
Dr. KITA (Guinea)
Ms. Joellen LAMBIOTTE (FPIA)
Dr. Rudolphe MAGLOIRE (Haiti)
Dr. Kadidiatou MAIKIBI (Niger)
Dr. Roland MALANO (Guinea)
Dr. Gardner MICHAUD (Haiti)
Dr. Alexandre MUHAWENIMANA (Rwanda)
Dr. Keita NAMORY (Regional Inspector, Conakry)
Dr. Emmanuel NKODO NKODO (Cameroon)
Dr. Serge PINTRO (Haiti)
Dr. Eleonore RABELHASA (Madagascar)
Mrs. Alou RAMATOU (Niger)
Dr. Jeannine RAVAOMANARIVO (Madagascar)
Dr. Jean RIRANGIRA (Burundi)
Dr. Marie-Claire RYANGUYENABI (Burundi)
Dr. Malika SADKI (Algeria)
Mr. Mbaya SEYE (Senegal)
Dr. Bandian SIDIMÉ (Guinea)
Mr. Ralph STONE (CEDPA)
Mr. Baba TRAORE (CERPOD)

BURKINA FASO

Dr. Toussaint OUEDRAOGO, Ministry of Health
Dr. Zeinab DERME, Ministry of Health
Mr. Youssef OUEDRAOGO, Population Council
Dr. Sidiosso Germain TRAORE, DSF
Ms. Claude MILOGOS, USAID
Joanny KABORAY, Management Sciences for Health
Jeanne NYAMÉOGE, Ministry of Social Action and Family
Felix COMPAORÉ
Celestin ZINCONE, Bacoma
Arsène OUEDRAOGO, Ministry of Health, Retired
Ms. P. CASSALON, DSF
Mrs. Pascaline SEBGO, Projet Femmes et Santé
Mrs. Thérèse ZEBA, UNFPA

MALI

Ibrahima K. BA
Dr. Doucoure Arkia DIALLO, Division de Santé
Familiale et Communautaire
Mme. Mariam Sidibé DICKO, A.S.D.A.P.
Isaiah Ade. EBO, UNFPA
Anne GAUDET, Canadian Embassy
John F. MAY, The Futures Group
Lucy S. MIZE, CEDPA
Sara PACQUÉ-MARGOLIS, USAID
Mme. Tatoumata Touré TRAORÉ, A.S.D.A.P.

SENEGAL

Paulette CHAPONNIERE, MSH
Dr. Sidiki COULIBALY, UNFPA
Dr. Charles DEBOSE, USAID
Ibrahima Lamine DIOP, UAPS
Dr. Marième DIOP (Senegal)
Robert DE WOLFE, MSH
William EMMET, MSH
Dr. Adama KONÉ, BASICS
Paul LIBISZOWSKI, MSH Senegal
Dr. Aboubacry THIAM, Conseiller en Santé Familiale

TOGO

Mrs. Kekeli AGOUNKE
Dr. Ayessou AKOUËLÉ, Division of Family Health
Mrs. AZANDOSSESSY CAPO-CHICHI, DSF
Adeleke EBO, UNFPA
Pape A. GAYE, INTRAH
Nyédzy A. KOUDAYA, ATBEF
Mr. Kwasi Charles MENSAH, CAFS
Dr. Mariam SANGARÉ, CAFS

ANNEX 4

COUNTRY REPRESENTATION AT FRAC

Country Representation at FRAC Meetings

Country	No. of Country Reps. at Meeting	Meetings Where Country was Represented							Total No. of Meetings With Representation
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	
Algeria	3				✓			✓	2
Benin	1							✓	1
Burkina Faso	7		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6
Burundi	2				✓			✓	2
Cameroon	7			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5
Côte d'Ivoire	4				✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Guinea	5				✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Haiti	4	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	5
Madagascar	3						✓	✓	2
Mali	5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Morocco	8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Niger	9			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5
Rwanda	8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Senegal	6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Togo	4				✓	✓	✓	✓	4
Tunisia	6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7
Zaire	3	✓	✓	✓					3

ANNEX 5

MAP

ANNEX 6

STATISTICAL TABLES

Table 1
Selected Indicators for FRAC Countries

Country	Total Population (millions)		Population Growth (Percent)		Infant Mortality Rate ^a		Child Mortality Rate ^b		Contraceptive Prevalence Rate ^c		Women in Polygamous Unions (%)	Per Capita GNP (US \$)	
	1986	1991	1980-91	1991-2000	1986	Current ^d	1975	1990	1986	Current	Current	1983	Current
Algeria	22.8	27.9	3.0	2.7	88	58	174	82	7	36	*	2320	1830
Benin	4.1	4.9	3.2	2.9	120	87	228	170	18	9	*	290	410
Burkina Faso	7.1	10.1	2.6	3.0	149	123	254	159	1	8	51.1	180	290
Burundi	4.9	6.0	2.9	2.9	124	105	209	180	1	9	11.6	240	210
Cameroon	10.0	13.1	2.8	3.1	103	81	194	125	3	16	38.6	820	820
Côte d'Ivoire	10.5	13.9	3.8	3.3	110	91	194	90	*	3	*	710	670
Guinea	6.2	6.4	2.6	2.9	159	147	297	268	1	*	*	300	510
Haiti	5.9	7.0	1.9	1.7	108	111	208	156	7	10	*	290	380
Madagascar	10.3	13.7	3.0	2.8	67	93	200	170	1	17	4.0	310	230
Mali	7.9	9.1	2.6	3.1	180	110	321	200	1	5	45.1	150	300
Morocco	23.7	28.6	2.6	2.2	97	57	174	71	26	42	5.1	760	1040
Niger	6.7	8.8	3.3	3.5	140	123	320	320	1	4	*	240	300
Rwanda	6.5	7.7	3.0	2.3	124	117	223	222	1	21	14.4	270	250
Senegal	6.9	8.2	3.0	2.8	127	80	265	156	4	7	46.5	440	780
Togo	3.0	4.3	3.4	3.1	107	94	193	143	*	34	52.3	280	400
Tunisia	7.2	8.7	2.4	1.9	85	43	140	45	41	5	*	1290	1740
Zaire	31.3	42.5	*	*	106	93	223	190	3	*	*	170	*

* indicates data not available or not applicable

Notes:

^a Per 1,000 live births

^b Probability of dying by exact age five

^c Total percentage of married women of childbearing age using
contraception

^d Most recent available figures

Sources:

The World Bank, 1986, 1993

Population Reference Bureau, 1986, 1994

DHS Surveys

Table 2
Education of Women

Country	Adult Literacy 1990		Proportion of primary age children in school 1990		Proportion of secondary age children in school 1990	
	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female
FRAC Countries						
Algeria	57	45	95	88	60	53
Benin	23	16	61	<u>44</u> ^a	11	6
Burkina Faso	18	9	36	28	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>
Burundi	50	40	72	<u>64</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
Cameroon	54	43	<u>101</u> ^b	<u>93</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>21</u>
Côte d'Ivoire	54	40	*	*	*	*
Guinea	24	13	37	24	10	5
Haiti	53	47	*	*	*	*
Madagascar	80	73	<u>92</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>18</u>
Mali	32	24	24	17	6	4
Morocco	49	38	<u>68</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>30</u>
Niger	28	17	29	21	7	4
Rwanda	50	37	<u>69</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>
Senegal	38	25	<u>58</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>
Togo	43	31	103	80	22	10
Tunisia	65	56	109	40	45	40
Zaire	*	*	*	*	*	*
Selected Anglophone Countries						
Ghana	60	51	<u>75</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>31</u>
Kenya	69	58	<u>94</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>19</u>
Nigeria	51	39	72	63	20	17
Sierra Leone	21	11	48	39	16	12
Tanzania	*	*	63	63	4	4
Zimbabwe	67	60	117	116	50	46

* indicates data unavailable

Notes:

^a Underlined figures are for years other than 1990.

^b Ratio of pupils to school-age population may exceed 100 percent because some pupils are younger or older than the country's standard primary age.

Source:

The World Bank, 1993.